



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,242	12/09/2003	Brian Jones	60001.296US01	4899
27488	7590	02/05/2008	EXAMINER _____	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			TSUI, WILSON W	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2178	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/05/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,242	JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4,6-12,14 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4,6-12,14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20071113s</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the RCE filed on: 10/31/2007, and IDS filed on: 11/13/2007.
2. Claims 1, 4, 10, 14, and 18 are amended. Claims 2-3, 5, 13, and 15 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 6-12, 14, 16-22 are pending.
3. The objection to claim 14 due to informalities is withdrawn, as necessitated by applicant's amendment.
4. The following rejections are withdrawn, in view of new grounds of rejection, necessitated by applicant's amendment:
 - Claims 1, 6-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al in further view of Sun Micro.
 - Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al and Sun Micro in further view of Pavlov.
 - Claims 10, 12, and 16-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al, Sun Micro, in further view of Klink et al.
 - Claims 11 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al, Klink et al and Sun Micro, in further view of Pavlov.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed 11/16/07 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because following IDS entry does not include a date: The J.Geigel et al reference does not include a year for 'January 21-26'.

Additionally, the following IDS entries/references are missing /have not been received by the USPTO:

- Simpson, J., "Just XML"
- Alshuler, L., "Getting the Tags In: Vendors grapple with XML-Authoring , Editing and Cleanup, "The Seybold Report on Internet Publishing, vol. 5, No. 6, Feb. 2001, pp. 1-6.
- Surajit Chaudhuri and Kyuseok Shim; "Storage and Retrieval of XML data using Relational Databases".
- Chiyoung Seo et al.; "An efficient inverted index technique for XML documents using RDBMS". YAWC Pro, "Welcom to YAWC Pro", December 11, 2001, 1 pg

It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12) in view of Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), and further in view of Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1).

With regards to claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method comprising:

- *Determining properties corresponding to a mini-document that relates to at least one section of an application document, the mini-document includes a body portion:* (Fig. 3, P6-5: whereas, layout analysis is performed to determine the properties for each block in a document (where each block relates to a segment of a document image, and thus represents a mini-document of the entire application document)). ... wherein the mini-document includes at least one member of a group comprising a header (P9-3, whereas, a mini-document is recognized to be a header (labeled as 'running-header')). Additionally, the mini-document has a body section, the body section comprises text such as the title of a header, as shown enclosed between the '<running-header>' and '</running-header>' markup, in P9-3).
- *Mapping the properties of the mini-document into a markup language element:* (P9-3: whereas, the properties of the mini-document, such as a running-header, is mapped into an element (labeled 'ID'), and assigned an ID value such as 'id0').

- *Storing the properties of the mini-document in the markup language document.*

(P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).

However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach wherein ... wherein the mini-document includes at least one member of a group comprising: a footer; mapping a type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document within the application document; and ...wherein the type attribute causes the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute.

Sun Micro teaches wherein *mapping a type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern of the mini-document within the application document* (page 89, whereas, a horizontal type attribute corresponds to an occurrence pattern of a mini-document/frame), wherein mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a context free chunk element (whereas, properties of an application word processing document are analyzed to determine the properties of different sections including table element properties (page 9: whereas, an application word processing document gets analyzed, such that the properties are stored in XML format, and page 234, wherein table properties of a word document, include table elements to describe a particular table in an application document) Additionally, as explained in page 142, whereas a footnote body includes a context free chunk element by implementing inline data.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's method for determining properties

corresponding to a mini-document, to have further included a mapping type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern, and mapping the properties into a context free chunk element The combination of Altamura et al and Sun Micro would have allowed Altamura et al to have implemented an "open standard for office documents" (Sun Micro, page 19).

However, Altamura et al and Sun Micro do not expressly teach wherein the type attribute *causes the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute.*

Yet, Eisenberg teaches wherein the type attribute *causes a document type to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute* (whether pages correspond to even, or odd number pages of a document (P1-4), as well as a *first page* (P1-2: whereas, a cover page is a sequence of one page).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's type attribute for whether a document (such as a mini-document comprising a body) occurs on a first, even, or odd pages as taught by Eisenberg. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "specified the order (of pages) when it was the time to generate a sequence of pages" (Eisenberg, P1-1), and to also have optimally described the occurrence of a sub/mini-document, should the sub/mini-document be common among a set of pages in an application document.

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method for a *mini-document occurring in a specified section of the application document* (in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale), and a *type attribute*, in claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach the type attribute corresponding to whether the mini-document occurs on *at least one member of a group comprising: odd pages of a specified section of the application document, or even pages of the application document.*

Yet, Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg teaches the *attributes* for whether the mini document corresponds to whether the mini-document occurs on *at least one member of a group comprising odd pages of the specified section of the application document, or even pages of the specified section of the application document*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method wherein:

- *Determining the properties corresponding to an additional mini-document that relates to at least one section of the application document:* (Fig. 3, p6-5: whereas, layout analysis is performed to determine one or more additional mini documents/blocks that have like properties in a document).
- *Mapping the properties of the additional mini-document into a markup language element, an attribute and a value:* (P9-3: whereas, the properties of the additional mini-document, such as a running-header, is mapped into an element (labeled

'ID'), and assigned an ID value such as 'id0' for one type of mini-document, and 'id4' for another type of mini document).

- *Storing the properties of the mini-document in the markup language document:* (P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).

Additionally, Sun Micro teaches wherein *mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a table element*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's method for determining properties corresponding to an additional mini-document, to have further included determining the properties comprise at least one of a table element, as taught by Sun Micro. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg would have allowed Altamura et al to have implemented an "open standard for office documents" (Sun Micro, page 19).

With regards to claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method comprising:

- *Determining whether properties associated with all mini-documents of the application document have been stored in the markup language document; and processing further mini-documents when the properties associated with all mini-documents have not been stored in the markup language document* (P7-9: whereas, the application document is translated into HTML/XML formats by

aggregating all textual, graphical, layout and logical information extracted in the document analysis and understanding process).

With regards to claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method wherein *the properties of the mini-document stored in the markup language document* (in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale), *are understood by an application that understands the markup language when the mini-document is not native to the application* (P7-10, Fig. 5: whereas, xml documents can be sent to a client browser that does not have the mini-document native to the application, through the help of a validating parser using an agreed schema of information exchange (DTD) + XML)).

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12), Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1), and further view of Pavlov (US Patent: 6,725,426 B1, published: Apr. 20, 2004, filed: Mar. 17, 2000).

With regards to claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method for wherein *the markup language document is manipulated on a client station to substantially reproduce the mini-document of the application document notwithstanding the presence of an application that generated the markup language document* (Section 6.2, Fig. 5: whereas, the properties stored in the markup document, are understood by a client web browser to reproduce the document without using WISDOM++). However

Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server* to reproduce the mini-document.

Pavlov teaches a markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document* (column 3, lines 59-65: whereas, a system capable of retrieving XML content is manipulated by a server to reproduce a document for a particular device).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's mini-document reproduction system to be reproduced on a server system as taught by Pavlov. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Pavlov would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "stored content in XML format instead of word processing documents" (Pavlov, column 1, lines 34-39).

8. Claims 10, 12, 14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12), Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1), in further view of Klink et al (DFKI, published, September 25, 2000, pages 1a, 3, 4, and 11).

With regards to claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium comprising:

- *Determining properties relating to a mini-document, wherein the mini-document includes a body portion having text (similar to claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale) used within a word processing document (P9-4: whereas, the image document is word processed since OCR technology is used to extract words from the image, and thus represents a word processing document as well).*
- *Determining whether the mini-document is at least one member of a group comprising a header (P9-3, whereas, a mini-document is recognized to be a header (labeled as 'running-header')).*
- *Writing the properties into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and a value, similarly in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.*
- *Storing the properties in the markup language document such that the headers of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application (P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).*

However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach *wherein writing the properties includes mapping a type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern of the text of the body portion of the mini-document within the word-processing document, wherein the type attribute causes the same text of the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute determining whether the mini-document is one of a footer, and the properties*

stored in a markup language file such that the *footers* of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application.

Altamura, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg similarly teach *writing the properties includes mapping a type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern of the text of the body portion of the mini-document within the word-processing document, wherein the type attribute causes the same text of the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However, Altamura, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg do not expressly teach *determining whether the mini-document is one of a footer*, and the properties stored in a markup language file such that the *footers* of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application.

Klink et al similarly teaches *determining whether the mini-document is one of a footer* (Section 4.1: whereas, each block/mini-document in the document are determined, including footers). Furthermore, Klink et al teaches storing properties of mini-document data in a markup language file (Section 7: whereas, document representation data can be stored in HTML/XML format)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's ability to determine whether a mini-document is a header, to also further include the ability to determine whether a mini-document is a footer for storage in a markup language document as taught by Klink et al. The

combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Klink et al would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have ensured that the footer properties in a markup language document would have been substantially maintained when a markup language document was stored by an application.

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium for performing a method similar to claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a method for a *mini-document occurring in a specified section of the word processing document* (in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale), and a *type attribute*, similarly in claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach the type attribute corresponding to *whether the mini-document occurs on at least one member of a group comprising: odd pages of a specified section of the application document, or even pages of the application document*.

Yet, Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg teaches the *attributes* for whether the mini document *corresponds to whether the mini-document occurs on at least one member of a group comprising odd pages of the specified section of the application document, or even pages of the specified section of the application document*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium comprises:

- *Determining properties corresponding to an additional mini-document that relates to at least one section (similarly in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale), of a word processing document (in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale).*
- *Mapping the properties of the additional mini-document into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and a value; and storing the properties of the additional mini-document in the markup language document: (as similarly taught in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale).*

Additionally, Altamura and Sun micro teach wherein the mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a table element, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium for performing a method similar to claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Klink teaches a system a processor and memory associated with computer-executable instructions configured to :

- *Determine properties relating to a mini-document included in at least one section of an application document, wherein the mini-document includes a body portion having text; determine whether the mini-document is at least one member of a group comprising: a header and a footer; map the properties into a markup*

language element, wherein mapping the properties includes mapping a type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern of the text of the body portion of the mini-document within the application document, wherein the type attribute causes the same text of the body portion be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute when the application document is generated from the markup language element, store the properties in the markup language element (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under similar rationale).

- Additionally, Altamura et al teaches *and a validation engine configured to validate the markup language document* (P7-10: whereas, a parser is used for validating the XML document).

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system wherein *the properties of the mini-document stored in the markup language document are understood by an additional application that understands the markup language when the mini-document is not native to the additional application* (P7-10, Fig.

5: whereas, xml documents can be sent to a additional application (client browser) that does not have the mini-document native to the additional application, through the help of a validating parser using an agreed schema of information exchange (DTD) + XML)).

9. Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12), Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1), Klink et al (DFKI, published, September 25, 2000, pages 1a, 3, 4, and 11), and further in view of Pavlov (US Patent: 6,725,426 B1, published: Apr. 20, 2004, filed: Mar. 17, 2000).

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al a computer readable medium comprising:

- A *word processing document*, similarly, in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *The markup language document is manipulated on a client to substantially reproduce the mini-document of the word-processing document notwithstanding the presence of an application that generated the markup language document* (Section 6.2, Fig. 5: whereas, the properties stored in the markup document, are understood by a client web browser to reproduce the document without using WISDOM++). However Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document*.

However, Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document*.

Pavlov teaches a markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document* (column 3, lines 59-65: whereas, a system capable of retrieving XML content is manipulated by a server to reproduce a document for a particular device).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's mini-document reproduction system to be reproduced on a server system as taught by Pavlov. The combination of Altamura et al, Klink et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Pavlov would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "stored content in XML format instead of word processing documents" (Pavlov, column 1, lines 34-39).

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 6-12, 14, and 16-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
11. With regards to claims 1, 10, and 18, the applicant argues that Altamura does not teach the amended limitation "*wherein the type attribute causes the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute*". This argument is not persuasive since a new grounds of rejection using an additional reference (Eisenberg); is used in combination with Altamura et al, and Sun Micro to teach the applicant's amended claim limitation. The

applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above for further explanation as to how the amended limitation is taught by the cited combination of references.

Additionally, the applicant argues that Sun Micro's Footnotes markup does not have attributes, however, the examiner respectfully points out that data enclosed within markup , such as within the opening and closing of the < ... footnote-body_> markup (Sun Micro, page 142), are attributes (such as the actual content of the footnote being the text content attribute of a footnote). Furthermore the applicant argues that Sun Micro teaches away from *wherein the type attribute causes the body portion to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute*"; since "Sun Micro teaches that the numbering of the footnotes or the labeling of the footnotes are attributes to indicate each particular footnote in the document". However, the "indication of the placement for each foot note" does not expressly imply or teach away that having more than one footnote in a particular document is bad/unwanted, or a disadvantage for use. Thus, Sun Micro does not teach away from the applicant's claimed language.

12. With regards to the rest of the claims that are dependent upon one of the independent claims (1, 10, or 18) being allowable since the independent claims are allowable, is not persuasive since the independent claims have been shown to be rejected, as similarly explained above.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W.T. 1/29/08

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
January 29, 2008


CESARIO PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER